

Remarks

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed September 8, 2004, the Examiner required new corrected drawings on grounds that Applicants' drawings are not meeting the requirements of 37 C.F.R.1.84 (i), objected to Figures 1-3 on grounds of a lack of proper designation as prior art, objected to Applicants' specification on grounds of a minor typographical error, and objected to claims 3-5 on grounds of informalities. The Examiner also rejected claims 6-10 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claims 1, 2, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,065,061 (Blahut), and further, claims 3-10 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Blahut and RFC 2516, titled "A Method for Transmitting PPP over Ethernet (PPPoE)" (Mamakos).

2. Status of Claims

Applicants have cancelled claims 1-16 and added a new set of claims 17-29 to recite the invention more clearly, as fully supported by Applicants' specification. Presently pending in this application are claims 17-29, of which claims 17, 19, 24, and 25 are independent and the remainder of claims are dependent.

3. Response to Drawing Objections

As noted above, the Examiner objected to the drawings on grounds that the character of lines, numbers, and letters do not meet requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.84(i). Applicants submit herein replacement drawing sheets of Figures 1-7, which are believed now to be in compliance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.84(i). In replacement Figure 7, Applicants have corrected block 68 to include the word "field" that was

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1-3, and 7. These sheets replace the original sheets including Figures 1-3, and 7. Amendments to the drawings are discussed on pages 9 and 10 in the "Remarks" section.

Additionally, Applicants have corrected Figures 1-7 to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.84(i) with respect to the character of lines, numbers, and letters.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets of Figures 1-7.

inadvertently omitted. Applicants submit that this correction is fully supported by Applicants' specification at, for example, page 19, line 11, and that no new matter has been added.

In addition, the Examiner objected to Figures 1, 2 and 3 of Applicants' drawings on grounds that the figures illustrate only that which is old and should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--. MPEP § 608.02(g).

Applicants have corrected Figures 1, 2, and 3 to include a legend --Prior Art--, as required by the Examiner. Applicants submit replacement Figures 1, 2 and 3, which are believed now to be in proper format, and request withdrawal of the objection.

4. Response to Specification Objections

As required by the Examiner, Applicants have amended the specification on page 14, line 9, to correct a minor typographical error.

5. Response to Claim Objections

As noted above, the Examiner objected to claims 3-5. Applicants have cancelled claims 3-5, rendering the objection moot.

6. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 6-10 and 14-16 on grounds of indefiniteness. Applicants have cancelled claims 6-10 and 14-16, rendering the rejections moot.

7. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 11 as being anticipated by Blahut. Applicants have cancelled claims 1, 2, and 11, rendering the rejections moot.

8. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 3-10 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Blahut and Mamakos.

Applicants have cancelled claims 3-10 and 12-16, rendering the rejections moot. Applicants also traverse the Examiner's rejections with respect to newly added claims 17-29 because the combination of Blahut and Mammakos does not teach or suggest all of the elements of any of these claims, as would be required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. M.P.E.P. § 2143.

Claims 17-29 are directed to selectively bridging Ethernet frames related to Point-to-Point Protocol over Ethernet (PPPoE) connections at a routing device.

More particularly, as recited in both independent claims 17 and 24 (and also dependent claim 18 by virtue of its dependence on claim 17), a routing device is configured to receive an Ethernet frame from a first terminal and (i) to bridge an Ethernet frame to a second terminal in response to a determination that an Ether_Type field of the Ethernet frame includes a discovery code or a session code indicating that the Ethernet frame is related to a PPPoE connection and (ii) to route the Ethernet frame to the second terminal in response to a determination that the Ether_Type field of the Ethernet frame does not include the discovery code or the session code. Thus, for example, the routing device can selectively bridge Ethernet frames determined to be related to a PPPoE connection and route other Ethernet frames, without reconfiguring the routing device to operate in a pure bridge mode.

Further, independent claims 19 and 25 (and also dependent claims 20-23 and 26-29 by virtue of their dependence on respective claim 19 or 25) recite a routing device (or

a method for use in a routing device) for selectively bridging an Ethernet frame related to a PPPoE connection, including additional limitations of: (i) storing a destination address of an Ethernet frame in memory in response to a determination that an Ether_Type field of the Ethernet frame includes a discovery code and (ii) determining whether the destination address matches a stored address in the memory in response to a determination that the Ether_Type field includes a session code. Thus, for example, the routing device can selectively bridge only those Ethernet frames that are related to recognized PPPoE connections, as determined from the destination address of an Ethernet frame matching an address stored in the memory during a discovery phase of a PPPoE connection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art, separately or in combination, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention as recited in each of claims 17-29.

10. Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all of presently pending claims 17-29 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request favorable reconsideration in view of the above amendments and remarks.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: January 10, 2005

By: Joanna Skyles

Joanna Skyles
Reg. No. 54,454